

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. Applicant has amended Claims 3, 4, 46 and 71 and added Claims 79-88, therefore Claims 1, 3-7, 11-22, 26-32, 34-38, 42-43, 46 and 59-88 remain pending in this application. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments and additions. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed May 19, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Claim Objections

Claims 3-4 and 71 stand currently objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.75. Applicant has amended Claims 3-4 and 71 to address these objections. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-7, 11-22, 26-32, 34-38, 42-43, 46 and 59-78 stand rejected as anticipated by Grosso, P., *XML Fragment Interchange* ("Grosso"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method of deploying a component of a site between systems, the method comprising: designating a component of the site intended for export; collecting at least one object of the component in an individual export file, wherein the at least one object includes at least one non-file asset configured to operate on a system at the remote location; transferring the individual export file to the system at the remote location; and extracting each object from the individual export file to a location on the remote system.

Thus, the method of Claim 1 deploys components of a site between systems. A site may be a collection of components; components in turn may be composed of other components or objects including file assets and non-file assets. Non-file assets may include portions of a functioning application such as software components needed to execute an application, the configuration of these software components, or the data that these software components process or operate on. These non-file assets may further include instantiated data objects; objects intended to configure the way a site looks and feels including menus, pages, styles or structures; and objects intended to designate who has access to other objects such as user groups or certain file assets.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

At least one of the objects which comprise a component designated for export is packaged in an individual export file. This at least one object includes at least one non-file asset configured to operate on a system at the remote location. As mentioned above, non-file assets include software components, the configuration of these software components, and the data that these software components process or operate over, which may include an instantiated data object. While in one particular embodiment these non-file assets may be constructed as extensible markup language (XML), it is neither necessary nor required that they be constructed in this manner before being packaged in the individual export file, and these non-file assets may be packaged in an individual export file in a variety of formats. This individual export file is then transferred to a system at a remote location; and each object is extracted from the individual export file to a location on the remote system where it is configured to operate.

In contrast to Claim 1, Grosso discloses a method for sending fragments of a well-formed XML document without having to send the entire XML document which originally contained the XML fragment. (Page 1-2, Abstract) To do this, Grosso uses fragment context information to provide information that is not available in the fragment of the XML document, but that would be available from the complete XML document from which the fragment has been excerpted. However, any information not available from the XML document (which may include external subsets of the document), or any knowledge of the location of the XML fragment within the original XML document, is out of scope for inclusion in the fragment context information. As pointed out by Grosso himself, this information and other metadata may well be useful in a variety of applications, but there need to be other mechanisms for handling this information.

Consequently, because Grosso only deals with XML documents, namely XML fragments from a well-formed XML document, and "does not consider interchange of information that is not well-formed XML" (Page 6), Grosso cannot provide a method for deploying components of a site as recited by Claim 1 and as asserted by the Examiner. More specifically, because the well-formed XML documents of Grosso are not part of a site, and Grosso does not deal with how these XML documents are selected, Grosso does not disclose designating a component of a site.

Additionally, Grosso does not disclose collecting at least one object of the component in an individual export file, wherein the at least one object includes at least one non-file asset configured to operate on the system at the remote location as recited by Claim 1 and as

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

asserted by the Examiner. Grosso discloses including only well-formed XML fragments in a fragment package and Grosso goes on to state that:

“while it is important to be able to package a fragment body with its fcs, it is expected that a general XML-friendly packaging mechanism will be developed...that would satisfy this requirement. Meanwhile, this Recommendation defines a simple association mechanism that doesn’t rely on a packaging scheme...this is beyond the scope of this Recommendation.” (Page 16-Page 17)

Thus, Grosso does not disclose how these XML fragments are packaged and thus does not disclose collecting at least one object of the component in an individual export file as recited by Claim 1.

Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that the fragment body of Grosso may be equated with the non-file asset of Claim 1. However, the non-file asset of Claim 1 is “configured to operate on the system at the remote location,” while the fragment body of Grosso cannot be used by an application at the recipient without a fragment context specification. In fact, this is one of the main purposes of Grosso, to provide context to a fragment body so the fragment body may be utilized without having to send all of the containing document from which the XML fragment was excerpted. Additionally, the portion of Grosso cited by the Examiner discloses that the recipient may process the fragment context specification to determine the proper parser state to enable an XML parser to parse the fragment body. Because a recipient cannot process a fragment body without a fragment context specification, a fragment body is not configured to operate on the system at the remote location and therefore cannot function as the non-file asset of Claim 1.

For the same reason (i.e. Grosso does not disclose collecting at least one object of the component in an individual export file and Grosso does not disclose that the at least one object includes at least one non-file asset), Grosso cannot disclose transferring the individual export file to the system at a remote location, or extracting each object from the individual export file to a location on the remote system

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claim 1 and its associated dependent Claims 3-7 and 59-62 is requested. Additionally, as independent Claims 11, 16, 26, 30 and 43 recite substantially the same limitations as Claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests

BEST AVAILABLE COPY


the withdrawal of the rejection of these independent claims and their respective dependent Claims 2-7, 12-22, 27-29, 31, 32 34-38, 42, 46, and 59-78.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1, 3-7, 11-22, 26-32, 34-38, 42-43, 46 and 59-88. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant



Ari G. Akmal
Reg. No. 51,388

Dated: **August 19, 2004**

P.O. Box 684767
Austin, Texas 78768-4767
Tel. (512) 637.9220
Fax. (512) 371.9088

BEST AVAILABLE COPY